



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ATTY.'S DOCKET: SAWAJIRI=2

In re Application of:	)	Art Unit: 3676
	)	
Yukio SAWAJIRI et al.	)	Examiner: Carlos Lugo
	)	
Appln. No.: 10/032,326	)	Washington, D.C.
	)	
Date Filed: December 31, 2001	)	Confirmation No.: 4583
	)	
For: REINFORCED VEHICLE DOOR	)	December 4, 2006
LATCH STRIKER	)	

REPLY BRIEF

Customer Service Window  
Randolph Building, Mail Stop APPEAL BRIEF  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

Replying to the Examiner's Answer mailed October 4, 2006, remarks begin on page 2 of this paper.

REMARKS

Enclosed herewith is Appellant's Request for an Oral Hearing of its appeal.

Appellant has made the following point in the last paragraph on page 9 of its August 30, 2006 Brief:

Even assuming that the Examiner's suggested prior art combination would be obvious (not admitted), the resulting structure still would not be equivalent to that claimed. There is no teaching whatever in the cited prior art combination (even if a rear side portion of the first leg 15A of Ichinose was modified to have a large diameter), that the latch of Hamada would engage the front side portion of the first leg above the rear side portion having the large diameter as claimed by Appellant rather than the rear side portion. Hamada teaches only a latch engaging a leg of a striker which is perpendicular to the base of the striker and has the same diameter from end to end (see Fig. 11 of Hamada).


In response, the Examiner submits an Attachment No. 1 in which the Examiner has identified the length of the engagement part of the 1<sup>st</sup> leg part of Ichinose and the length of the rear part of 1<sup>st</sup> leg part of Ichinose. This is done arbitrarily with no prior art teaching as the diameter of the 1<sup>st</sup> leg part of Ichinose is uniform throughout the length of the 1<sup>st</sup> leg giving no hint of a rear or engaging part.

Appellant submits that to the extent that Mark teaches thickening, the rear part of the 1<sup>st</sup> leg part of Ichinose (not admitted) there is no teaching whatever how far up the length of the rear leg thickening should be. Indeed, Appellant submits that Mark teaches that the thickening should extend virtually up to its front connecting part, well past the point where the Ichinose latch is shown in Attachment No. 1 to engage the 1<sup>st</sup> leg of Ichinose. Accordingly, if Mark teaches the thickening of the 1<sup>st</sup> leg of Ichinose as maintained by the Examiner, the Ichinose latch as modified by Hamada would engage the rear part of the 1<sup>st</sup> leg and not the engaging part as claimed.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichinose in view of Mark further in view of Hamada is not supportable and should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By   
Norman J. Latker  
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\BN\N\Niiz\Sawajiri2\PTO\2006-12-04 Reply Brief.doc